



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,735	09/30/2004	Lee George LABORCZFALVI	2006579-0243	5734

69665 7590 10/23/2009  
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART / CITRIX SYSTEMS, INC.  
TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE  
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER
----------

HUARACHA, WILLY W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2195

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/23/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

<b>Application No.</b> 10/711,735	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LABORCZFALVI ET AL.
<b>Examiner</b> WILLY W. HUARACHA	<b>Art Unit</b> 2195

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 21 September 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
 7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
 Claim(s) allowed: None.  
 Claim(s) objected to: None.  
 Claim(s) rejected: 1-34.  
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
 13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Meng-Ai An/  
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2195

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Remarks in page 9, in regards to rejection 112 first paragraph, applicant contends that the limitation "responsive to the application isolation layer and the user isolation layer forming the isolation environment in which the process executes" by pointing to par. 61-68, 83 and 97-101. However the Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant because there's still insufficient support for the step of selecting a rule in response to the application isolation layer and the user isolation layer forming the isolation environment. At best it appears that the rule selection is made in response to a request for access to a system object.

Remarks in page 12, in regards to rejection under 102(e) of claim 26, Applicant argues that "Demsey fails to teach or suggest (i) a process executing in the context of an isolation environment which comprises an application isolation layer and a user isolation layer ... Demsey's applications 102 run in "user code", this is not a user isolation layer, as Demsey only has a single user. Demsey's distinction is between system code and user code, the latter being .exe files "executed by the user of the computer environment to run the application, and therefore [causing] the application perform as desired by the user.". In fact, Demsey is silent regarding multiple users or isolation of one user from another" The Examiner thanks the applicant for pointing out the details of the invention. However, it should be noted that the claim language of independent claims 26 does not explicitly define a user isolation layer, nor does it indicate multiple users or isolation of one user from another. Additionally, the claimed language does not explicitly define how the terms "application isolation layer" and "user isolation layer" and their respective structure and function relate to perform the steps in claim 26. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read in to the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181 USPQ2d 1047 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Remarks In pages 12-13, Applicant argues that "Demsey fails to teach or suggest the process requesting access to a system object, in which the request includes a virtual name". The Examiner, respectfully disagrees because the system of Demsey does specifically teach an application requesting for access to a native resource. Wherein it is inherent that an application must initially provide a name for the specific native resource being requested for access. Additionally, the term "virtual name" as claimed in claim 26 is no more than an object name.

Remarks in page 13, Applicant argues that "Demsey fails to teach forming a literal name for the system object". However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant because Demsey does teach forming a literal name (fig. 3, step 310).

Remarks in page 14-15, in regards to 103(a) rejection of claim 1, Applicant argues that Demsey fails to teach or suggest: "a process executing in a context of an isolation environment, the isolation environment comprising an application isolation layer and a user isolation layer; the process requesting access to a system object, the request including a virtual name for the system object; and forming a literal name for the system object". However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant for similar reasons as mentioned above for claim 26.